1	Benjimin M. Brees, Esq. (CSB #148020)	
2	Benjimin M. Brees, Esq. (CSB #148020) Law Offices of Benjimin Michael Brees 3033 5 th Avenue, Suite 201 San Diego, CA 92103 Tel: (619) 236-8355 Fax: (619) 374-7056	
3		
4	Email: info@BenBreeslaw.com	
5	Attorney for Plaintiff JOEL RICHARDSON	
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
10		
11		22000
12		
13		
	JOEL RICHARDSON,	Case No. 3:24-cv-00209-RFL
15	Plaintiff,	PLAINTIFF'S STATEMENT OF NON-
16	vs.	OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT TESLA'S REQUEST FOR ARBITRATION
17	TESLA, INC., dba TESLA MOTORS, INC.,	
18	TESLA FINANCE; and DOES 1-100,	Hon. Rita F. Lin Courtroom 15-18 th Floor
19	inclusive,	Hearing Date: July 16, 2024
20	Defendants.	Time: 10:00 a.m.
21 22		
$\begin{bmatrix} 22 \\ 23 \end{bmatrix}$		
23		_
25		
26		
27		
28		

COMES NOW Plaintiff, by and through his counsel of record, Benjimin Michael Brees and files this Statement of Non-Opposition to TESLA's Request for Arbitration.

I. Plaintiff Is Not Opposed to Arbitration Conditioned on Tesla Paying All Fees and Arbitration Occurring in San Diego, California.

Plaintiff filed his Complaint in San Diego Superior Court on October 28, 2022. Tesla filed a motion to have the case removed to the Southern District of California. Tesla then had this case removed to the Northern District of California. All this time, Tesla never filed never moved for arbitration until now.

Tesla's November 21, 2023, email from Alan E. Shoenfeld, Esq. was responded to on November 23, 2023. Counsel for Plaintiff informed Mr. Alan E. Shoenfeld, Esq. that he was not aware of any arbitration agreement. Counsel Brees also asked if Tesla would object to an amendment of the complaint and to remand the case to State Court in San Diego.

Counsel had intended to oppose the motion to compel arbitration based on untimeliness but after reviewing *In re Tesla Advanced Driver Assistance Sys. Litig.*, , 2023 U.S. Lexis 176556* 2023; WL 6391477.

The Court has stated the opposition was due on June 18, 2024, but Plaintiff was served by US Mail (Docket 33) per the proof of service which arrived at our office, thus Plaintiff believed that the Opposition was due 14 days after service, plus 4 days for mailing, but since the 22 of June was on a Saturday, the opposition would be due on June 24, 2024.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 24, 2024

Benjimin M. Brees Attorney for Plaintiff JOEL RICHARDSON